

1 PHILLIP A. TALBERT
2 United States Attorney
3 STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
6 Fresno, CA 93721
7 Telephone: (559) 497-4000
8 Facsimile: (559) 497-4099
9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 United States of America

11
12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
15 Plaintiff,
16 v.
17
18 WESLEY TSUKAMOTO,
19 JASON AGUILAR,
20 DARCY CALAFIORE,
21 CESAR ESTEVAN RODRIGUEZ,
22 HECTOR HERNANDEZ,
23 RICK LEE HUTCHINSON, and
24 ANTOINETTE MAGER,
25 Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:21-CR-00115-DAD-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
FINDINGS AND ORDER

DATE: January 12, 2022
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

This case is set for status conference on January 12, 2022. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further notice.” Further, pursuant to General Order 611, this Court’s declaration of judicial emergency under U.S.C. § 3174, and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council’s Order of April 16, 2020 continuing this Court’s judicial emergency, this Court has allowed district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after May 2, 2021.¹ This and previous General Orders, as well as the declarations of judicial emergency, were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

Although the General Orders and declarations of emergency address the district-wide health

¹ A judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” at the discretion of that judge “or upon the request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020).

1 concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision
 2 "counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record
 3 findings" in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-
 4 record findings, there can be no exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such
 5 failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153
 6 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit
 7 findings on the record "either orally or in writing").

8 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory
 9 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 and the subsequent declaration of judicial
 10 emergency require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if "the
 11 judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such
 12 action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial." 18 U.S.C.
 13 § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless "the court sets forth, in the record of
 14 the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of
 15 such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial." *Id.*

16 The General Orders and declaration of judicial emergency exclude delay in the "ends of justice."
 17 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address
 18 continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has
 19 discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-
 20 week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens' eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d
 21 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed.
 22 *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to
 23 exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency).
 24 The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated
 25 by the statutory rules.

26 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following
 27 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-
 28

1 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).² If continued, this Court should designate a new date
2 for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any
3 pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

4 **STIPULATION**

5 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendants, by and
6 through defendants’ counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

- 7 1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on January 12, 2022.
- 8 2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until April 13,
9 2022, and to exclude time between January 12, 2022, and April 13, 2022, under 18 U.S.C.
10 § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].

11 3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

12 a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case
13 includes reports, photographs, and audio files and is voluminous. This discovery has been either
14 produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying, and the
15 production of or availability of more discovery is anticipated.

16 b) Counsel for defendants desire additional time to further review discovery, discuss
17 potential resolution with defendants and the government, and investigate and prepare for trial.

18 c) Counsel for defendants believe that failure to grant the above-requested
19 continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking
20 into account the exercise of due diligence.

21 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

22 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
23 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
24 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

25 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
26 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of January 12, 2022 to April 13,

27 _____
28 ² The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make
“additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.
Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code
2 T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis
3 of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best
4 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

5 g) The parties also agree that this continuance is necessary for several reasons,
6 including but not limited to, the need to permit time for the parties to exchange supplemental
7 discovery, engage in plea negotiations, and for the defense to continue its investigation and
8 preparation, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i) and (iv).

9 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
10 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial
11 must commence.

12 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

13 Dated: December 28, 2021

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

14 _____
15 /s/ STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN
16 STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN
17 Assistant United States Attorney

18 Dated: December 28, 2021

19 _____
20 /s/ JOHN GARLAND
21 JOHN GARLAND
22 Counsel for Defendant
23 WESLEY TSUKAMOTO

24 Dated: December 28, 2021

25 _____
26 /s/ ROGER WILSON
27 ROGER WILSON
28 Counsel for Defendant
 JASON AGUILAR

Dated: December 28, 2021

/s/ KOJO MOORE
KOJO MOORE
Counsel for Defendant
CESAR ESTEVAN
RODRIGUEZ

1 Dated: December 28, 2021

2 _____
3 /s/ DAVID BALAKIAN
4 DAVID BALAKIAN
Counsel for Defendant
HECTOR HERNANDEZ

5 Dated: December 28, 2021

6 _____
7 /s/ MICHAEL BERDINELLA
MICHAEL BERDINELLA
Counsel for Defendant
DARCY CALAFIORE

8 Dated: December 28, 2021

9 _____
10 /s/ DOUGLAS FOSTER
DOUGLAS FOSTER
Counsel for Defendant
ANTOINETTE MAGER

11 Dated: December 28, 2021

12 _____
13 /s/ RICHARD BESHWATE
RICHARD BESHWATE
Counsel for Defendant
RICK LEE HUTCHINSON

14
15 **ORDER**

16 IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from January 12, 2022, to **April 13,**
17 **2022, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe.** Time is excluded pursuant to 18
U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: January 5, 2022

22 _____
23 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25
26
27
28